

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,554	10/31/2000	Katsumi Nihei	Q61559	7384
	7590 09/04/2007 Zinn Macpeak & SEas	EXAMINER		
2100 Pennsylva	ania Ave N W	USTARIS, JOSEPH G		
Washington, D	C 20037-3202		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/699,554	NIHEI, KATSUMI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Joseph G. Ustaris	2623		

Derere and rining or an rippear Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph G. Ustaris	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A  1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	06.07(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	36(a) and the appropria of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	te extension fee iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further compared to the state of the</li></ol>	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow); tter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally rej	TE below); ducing or simplifying	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s).  6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	·	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		II be entered and an e	explanation of
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
<ul> <li>10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See attached.</li> </ul>		•	
<ul><li>12. ☑ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>		MULLEY HRIS KELLEY	, ר

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

#### Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on August 21, 2007 was filed after the mailing date of the Office Action on April 27, 2007. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### Response to Arguments

2. The objection to Claim 9 and the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claim 12 are now withdrawn in view of the amendments.

Applicant's arguments filed August 27, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues with respect to claims 1-4 and 8-13 that Alexander discloses the use of zip codes, which is a fixed position and does not change over time. Therefore, applicant believes that the combination of Alexander and Bandera's mobile receiver is improper. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Alexander does disclose the use of the viewer's zip code. The use of this zip code is to identify the viewer's location in order to deliver targeted advertisements much like the systems disclosed by Zigmond and Bandera. Bandera discloses the advantages of apply the system of targeting advertising to mobile clients in order to provide a more efficient means of advertising that reaches a wider ranger of users, especially mobile users (See col. 2 lines 11-27). Therefore, the examiner believes that the combination of Zigmond, Alexander, and Bandera is proper.

Application/Control Number: 09/699,554 Page 3

Art Unit: 2623

Applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

#### Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph G. Ustaris whose telephone number is 571-272-7383. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5 PM; Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 09/699,554

Art Unit: 2623

JGU

August 29, 2007

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Page 4